



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/811,273	03/25/2004	Christopher Brockett	M61.12-0618	2161
27366 7590 11/06/2008 WESTMAN CHAMPLIN (MICROSOFT CORPORATION) SUITE 1400 900 SECOND AVENUE SOUTH MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-3244				
EXAMINER SHAH, PARAS D				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2626				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
11/06/2008		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Interview Summary

Application No.

10/811,273

Applicant(s)

BROCKETT, CHRISTOPHER

Examiner

PARAS SHAH

Art Unit

2626

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) PARAS SHAH.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Mai Lauer.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 04 November 2008.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal (copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Lee ("Acquisition of English-Chinese TRansliterated word pairs from Parallel Aligned Texts using a Statistical Machine Transliteration Model).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The limitations that were added to claim 1 were discussed, which were not entered after the final rejection. It was stated that the reference of Lee still teaches the limitation but under a 103 rejection (single reference). Further, the 112 issues were discussed. The examiner withdrew the 112, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph rejection and the Applicant's repetitive agreed to remove the term exclusively.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/P. S./  
Examiner, Art Unit 2626

/Patrick N. Edouard/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2626